

## **REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully traverse and request reconsideration.

Claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2001/0042043 (Shear et al.). Claim 22 also stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kori et al. in view of Shear et al. Applicants cancel claim 22 without prejudice.

Applicants also respectfully reserve the right to swear behind any cited reference if desired.

Claims 16-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kori et al. in view of Official Notice Taken (supporting reference provided US 4,593,384) and further in view of Shear et al. It is admitted that the Lori and official notice references do not teach among other things, that the stored video content does not include any embedded access parameter. The office action cites Shear for allegedly teaching this subject matter and cites to Shear, FIG. 3B. The office action states that the certain individual still frames would not comprise protection information when copied. However, Applicants respectfully submit that it appears that the claim language is being misapprehended. The claim refers to “video data” as being stored. A single frame or still frame is not video data. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the Shear reference does not teach what is alleged. Also Shear teaches that the analog access codes are stored with the content as part of a secured container even where those access codes indicate that certain still frames can be used. Accordingly, Shear teaches away from separating the access indicators information from the stored video. Applicants respectfully submit that Shear actually requires that the content and analog access code be placed in a “secure container” (see page 5) and as such, describes a container based approach.

Applicants claim a different approach wherein a controller receives the indication of data access restriction which is independent from the stored digital information. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are allowable since no secured container structure is required by Applicants' claims and Applicants claim a different process and operation.

The dependent claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are now in condition for allowance and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (312) 609-7599.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 2, 2009

By: /Christopher J. Reckamp/  
Christopher J. Reckamp  
Registration No. 34,414

Vedder Price P.C.  
222 North LaSalle Street, Suite 2600  
Chicago, Illinois 60601  
phone: (312) 609-7599  
fax: (312) 609-5005